UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,861	10/20/2004	Yuko Matsumura	P25617	5143
	7590 04/08/201 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.(	EXAMINER		
1950 ROLAND	CLARKE PLACE	SZPIRA, JULIE ANN		
RESTON, VA	20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/08/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/500,861	MATSUMURA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JULIE A. SZPIRA	3731		

	JULIE A. SZFINA	3/31	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 January 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FC	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complianc time periods:	ring replies: (1) an amendment, a ice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	ffidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the maili	ng date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70		IE FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 ension and the corresponding amoun hortened statutory period for reply ori	t of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t	o avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beth appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially r	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally re	ejected claims.	
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>	·		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-7 and 10-17.		rill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under app and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attacl	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet	does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:
See Continuation Sheet.  12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SR/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:	1 10/35/06/1 apel No(3)		
/Anhtuan T. Nguyen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731	/J. A. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 373 <sup>-</sup> March 28, 2011		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments have not been found persuasive.

The argument that Talish does not disclose using ultrasound to penetrate and treat skin is not persuasive. Talish teaches applying ultrasonic energy in the range of 3 to 7 MHz to skin. Redding teaches the delivery of a therapeutic substance through the skin using ultrasonic energy. Talish teaches therapeutic ultrasonic treatment at a specific frequency range. The combination of therapeutic substance delivery at a specific frequency range would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. Talish teaches a specific frequency range that provides the best penetration of the ultrasonic waves, and therefore, the best penetration of the therapeutic substance disclosed by Redding.

The argument that McDaniel in combination with Redding does not teach whitening of skin is not persuasive. Redding discloses delivering a therapeutic substance into the skin, and McDaniel teaches delivering a substance that would lighten skin or reduce wrinkles. The specification of the instant application does not disclose that whitening is meant to me anything other than "removing extra pigment", and therefore, the method of lightening or reducing extra pigment as disclosed by McDaniel is the same step as disclosed in the claims of the present invention. Furthermore, in paragraph 73 of the published application (US 2005/0043654) the term "brighter" is used interchangeably with the term "whiter", further asserting that making skin "lighter" or "brighter" would be considered "whitening". The range of frequencies disclosed in McDaniel are the same as that claimed in the present invention, and therefore, McDaniel teaches the elements of the present invention.